University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

To Improve the Academy

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

1990

Integrating Teaching and Research: A Multidimensional Career Model

Mary Pat Mann

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad>

Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Mann, Mary Pat, "Integrating Teaching and Research: A Multidimensional Career Model" (1990). *To Improve the Academy*. 201.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/201>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in To Improve the Academy by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Integrating Teaching and Research: A Multidimensional Career Model

Mary Pat Mann

Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine

As faculty development expands beyond the realm of teaching improvement, it embraces the whole of academic life. While retaining a strong commitment to the teaching role, faculty developers today realize what faculty knew all along: Teaching does not take place in a vacuum. In extending the scope of faculty development programs, we support teaching by supporting the teaching faculty.

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing faculty developers in expanding their roles is how to integrate scholarship into programs formerly focused exclusively on teaching. Most current writers see teaching and research in conflict, pulling faculty in opposing directions. Those who see teaching as the primary faculty responsibility decry the trend toward greater specialization and demand for outside funding, claiming that such pressures drive faculty out of the classroom. Those committed to research say that faculty must maintain their scholarship as the foundation of teaching at the college level. Faculty themselves do not agree on these issues; many become dissatisfied with the balance between teaching and research in their own careers (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; S. Clark, 1986; Light, 1974; Rice, 1986).

A focus on teaching improvement has not allowed faculty developers to explore how faculty integrate their professional roles or to support their necessary efforts to do so (Mathis, 1983). To enter this arena, we need models of the academic career that consider how teaching and research

can complement rather than compete with each other: New programs need new visions of the faculty role. This paper will review some limitations of current views of the academic career, suggest a more integrative alternative, and discuss how a new approach can enhance faculty development programs.

The Academic Matrix: Teaching and Research

The idea that faculty engage in distinct professional roles is reflected in most discussions of higher education. Often omitted, however, is the recognition that this makes academia quite different from other work settings. Weick (1984) views universities as loose organizational structures which value individual creativity more than social cohesiveness. In corporations, functions like research, product development, recruitment, training, and management are handled by separate units. In higher education, faculty are expected to play key roles in all. This “extreme degree of individualism” (Weick, 1984, p. 16) presents a unique challenge to faculty because “the tight linkages within universities occur within single individuals” (p. 16).

Tight linkages within the individual permit and in fact lead to loose coupling elsewhere in the organization, which Weick (1976) defines as follows:

It might seem that the word coupling is synonymous with words like connection, link, or interdependence, yet each of these latter terms misses a crucial nuance. By loose coupling, the author intends to convey the image that coupled events are responsive, *but* that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical and logical separateness. (p. 3)

Observers often bemoan the lack of managerial controls within departments, across departments, and even across institutions with similar missions. Some may be uncomfortable with the idea of loose coupling and its implication that universities behave in irrational ways. Discomfort may stem from concern that scholarship itself will be seen as disorganized. But to say that universities as organizations are loosely coupled does not imply the same about research or teaching. In fact, Weick (1984) argues that the dedication to truth that characterizes academia is a principal cause of loose coupling at the organizational level. Cohesion reduces accuracy as, in turn, accuracy reduces cohesion. Higher education has a commitment to accuracy that limits the cohesion between

individuals and across organizational units. Faculty autonomy fits squarely within accepted academic values.

Two central faculty roles are linked to academia's most visible and yet most loosely coupled dimensions: the disciplines and the institutions. The disciplines and their organizations are customarily associated with research; the institutions are the halls of learning now associated with the teaching role (Finkelstein, 1984). Most observers agree that today the disciplinary dimension is in the ascendant. For example, Burton Clark (1987) sees academic careers as defined by the disciplines, modified by an "institutional axis [which places faculty in] a matrix of disciplinary affiliations and institutional assignments" (p. 188).

Some see additional career dimensions. Toombs (1975) proposed a three-part model that includes the professional (research) dimension but separates the curricular from the institutional dimension to highlight the faculty role in both teaching and governance. Others (S. Clark, 1986; Rice, 1986) argue that external activities such as consulting, government service, or other types of public service should be considered as a separate dimension. Although the bulk of consulting and outside professional work can be subsumed under the disciplinary dimension, entrepreneurial activity may constitute a new and quite different faculty role (Bird & Allen, 1989). For most faculty, however, the principal sources of reward and sanction reside in the institutions and the disciplinary organizations (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; B. Clark, 1987; Finkelstein, 1984).

What evidence exists about the relationship between the teaching and research roles? For every author arguing for conflict, another will support complementarity. Yet actual research is limited. In an exhaustive synthesis, Kenneth Feldman (1987) analyzed results from studies of the link between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. After reviewing simple correlations between productivity measures (publications, grants, or citations) and student ratings of teaching, he went on to consider the possible impact of a number of other variables related to the instructor (e.g., age, rank) and the class (e.g., size, elective vs. required courses). He concluded that the relationship between achievements in teaching and research is positive but very weak; essentially, these two roles are independent.

It may seem unreasonable to suggest that teaching effectiveness and research productivity could be independent. Surely the time spent on one activity is taken away from the other. Boice (1987), however, corroborates Feldman's conclusion from a different angle by arguing that released time is not effective in increasing productivity and, in fact, reinforces the

erroneous assumption that teaching or research can only improve at the expense of the other. Efficiency and the ability to manage one's time are far more critical issues than being released from teaching assignments.

The available evidence, then, suggests that levels of achievement in teaching and research are independent or orthogonal, as shown in Figure 1. The zero point, or origin, of each dimension marks the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable achievement. There is a range of acceptable levels of involvement and a variety of measures for each area. Research is usually measured in terms of publications, grants, citations, or some combination of these. Teaching is assessed in terms of class hours and enrollments, advising load, doctoral committees, student ratings, and sometimes other measures of effectiveness.

It is important to note that both the point of origin and the scale on each dimension will vary across institutions and disciplines because the amount of research and teaching expected of faculty varies. In other

FIGURE 1: The Academic Matrix

words, all institutions encourage a range of faculty roles, but the ranges differ. Research universities, for example, generally expect more involvement in research and look for less in teaching than four-year or community colleges. The overwhelming majority of faculty at any given institution will fall into the upper right quadrant of its graph, since those not maintaining at least minimally acceptable levels of activity in each dimension will not remain long. Yet these same individuals might be judged as adequate or even superior in a new setting, as illustrated in Figure 2.

If the two central faculty roles, teaching and research, can function independently, how do faculty combine them into a cohesive professional life? Some suggest that the concept of an academic profession provides a framework for integrating professional roles. Finkelstein (1984) referred to the “normative context” provided by the shared values of professional autonomy, academic freedom, and the merit principle. Kuh and Whitt

FIGURE 2: The Range of Role Orientations

(1988) found that basic values provided “a sense of collective identity” (p. 17). Their list of values, however, included the importance of producing knowledge, individual autonomy, and collegiality. Burton Clark (1987) suggested that shared values offered “a sustaining myth that can overshadow diminished material rewards” (p. 222). For individuals, academic values may provide a sense of shared culture but offer no concrete suggestions for how to balance conflicting demands.

In fact, most researchers today see no real integration between these spheres. Finkelstein (1984) found that “disciplinary and institutional affiliation serve as the points of intersection between the two subsystems [which] remain distinct in their contradictory pulls and pushes on the individual faculty member” (p. 61). Bowen and Schuster (1986) see the impact of career subsystems primarily in the tension between graduate-level socialization to research and institutional pressure to teach. Burton Clark (1987) describes an accelerating trend toward disciplinary specialization held in check by the demands of undergraduate teaching.

The picture that emerges is one of a rich but contentious environment. Each faculty member has a discipline and often a specialty within it; each works in an institution which expects a certain level of involvement in teaching, advising, committee work, and other service as well as scholarly work. There is enormous diversity among disciplines and across institutions, no formal link between these two dimensions of the academic matrix, and little explicit guidance for faculty in making career decisions. We need to look elsewhere for a view of how faculty integrate their professional roles.

Career Choices and Role Orientation

Perhaps much current writing on the faculty career highlights its difficulties and paradoxes without addressing solutions because solutions are not forthcoming at the institutional or disciplinary levels. Moving from the general to the particular, however, reveals that individual faculty have been very resourceful in creating their own careers. It is at this level that choices are made about how much effort to put into research and how much into teaching. In fact, part of the attraction of academia is the opportunity to find a niche within its matrix that meets one's own needs.

For example, Reynolds (1990) views the early development of faculty as determined by the match between individual personalities and professional goals, and the organizational climate and expectations. Presenting case studies of five faculty, she contrasts the relatively easy adjustments of Jeff and Greta with the more difficult transitions of Jason, Nancy, and

Josie. All five found the lack of collegiality in their research university daunting, but Jeff's and Greta's professional goals matched departmental expectations so both did well. Nancy continued to struggle with the lack of professional interaction and devoted time and energy to developing more; Jason considered moving to another university to reduce the stress of meeting his professional and family obligations; and Josie did leave to return to the more teaching-oriented college in which she had taught before. Reynolds (1990) describes each case in terms of unique preferences and decisions made in the absence of career advice or any particular support.

The idea that faculty choose different career paths can be traced to Gouldner's (1957) identification of two types, the local and the cosmopolitan. The major distinction rested in where faculty placed principal allegiance, the institution or the discipline. The "local" faculty member was loyal to the institution, devoting himself to teaching and university service rather than research. The "cosmopolitan" focused on research and professional service. For her, colleagues within the discipline provided the principal reference group.

For many, images of "local" and "cosmopolitan" faculty have been reduced to stereotypes offering little insight into the range of actual behaviors. The research literature, however, tells a different story. Gouldner (1958) and others (e.g., Cornwall & Grimes, 1987; Entrekin & Everett, 1981; Glaser, 1964; Lammers, 1974) found that locals and cosmopolitans were not simply two ends of a single continuum. Rather, localism and cosmopolitanism represent central concepts around which a constellation of roles are clustered.

Cornwall and Grimes (1987) identify five dimensions within the cosmopolitan-local construct: 1) Professional commitment, or the desire to contribute to one's discipline; 2) Commitment to organizational goals; 3) Organizational immobility, or the extent to which one wants or is able to leave one's institution; 4) Concern for advancement; and 5) Reference group orientation, or the degree to which one's principal interactions are inside or outside the institution. Glaser (1964) found that scientists working for research companies had less role conflict when their professional goals and the organization's goals were similar. This suggests why faculty committed to teaching are unhappy in research universities and why graduates of prestigious research programs sometimes have a difficult adjustment to the colleges in which they find positions (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Rice, 1986).

The work preferences of faculty interact with institutional culture and specific events to create a variety of role orientations. In addition, role orientations can change over time. In fact, Cornwall and Grimes (1987) found that faculty adjust their role orientations in relation to events such as professional rewards and recognition. They conclude that development of role orientations is an ongoing process, not one that ends with graduate training, and that organizations and events shape how faculty view themselves and their careers.

Role orientation studies offer three concepts relevant to faculty development. First, a range of career roles is available to faculty, even within a single academic department. Second, faculty make conscious choices to pursue the type of career they prefer. Consider the five faculty discussed above (Reynolds, 1990). Given their case histories, they might fall within the academic matrix as shown in Figure 3. All were able to meet

FIGURE 3: Placing Faculty within the Matrix

the minimum requirements of a research university, but they did so in different ways; some did better than others, and one chose to go elsewhere. Third, role orientations change over time and can be influenced by the recognition faculty receive for their efforts.

Expanding Faculty Development

Seeing faculty as active participants in a fluid enterprise suggests a myriad of new programs and interventions for faculty development. Here I would like to consider three approaches to integrating these broader issues of scholarship and professional development within faculty development programs: career development, professional skills development, and research on teaching.

1. Support the overall career development of faculty members.

Most graduate students and a surprising number of faculty lack good information on which to base career decisions. Some are unhappy with the consequences of past decisions; many who are satisfied continue to seek enriching experiences, and faculty from each group sometimes turn to teaching support programs for new opportunities. Yet few faculty developers address the career development needs of faculty directly (Wheeler, 1988), although we are well placed to do so. We work with faculty at all stages of their careers and across disciplines, thereby developing a broad perspective on the academic career. Through our interactions with faculty, chairs, and administrators, we can gain a similar understanding of what our institutions expect from faculty, especially in teaching. In addition, faculty development or teaching improvement centers are often the locus of new faculty orientation and TA training programs which could be expanded to address career planning issues.

Career advice for graduate students may be particularly important now because of the "changing rules" (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 150) of higher education. Students who become "strongly acculturated to the ways and values of the major universities, where great emphasis is placed on research and scholarship [may not be prepared] for life in the vast majority of colleges and universities, where the dominant task is undergraduate instruction" (p. 34). Rice (1986) argued that the socialization acquired by graduate students in research universities leads to distress and a sense of failure among those unable to find positions in research universities.

Some years ago, Schein (1968) noted a disjunction between the expectations of graduating MBAs and of the corporations that hired them. He recommended increasing the coordination between professional and organizational socialization through apprenticeship programs and placement support. Many professional schools are currently expanding such programs for their students. This could be translated to higher education as a whole by developing opportunities for graduate students to visit and perhaps teach in a variety of institutions and providing information on the probable expectations of hiring institutions. For example, a program being developed by the Association of American Colleges will allow graduate students at three universities to work with faculty at nearby liberal arts colleges, observing them in class and discussing career interests and plans. The students will also participate in seminars on teaching in their disciplines and on working with students ("In' box," 1989). Such programs are not likely to be provided by hiring institutions which in the recent market have not invested heavily in new faculty. Rather, they would need to become part of degree programs which maintain an interest in the fate of their graduates. Why not link them to TA training?

Faculty developers may be able to assist faculty as well as graduate students in clarifying their career goals and creating a satisfying professional role. Clarity is particularly important for unionized faculty who negotiate annual performance contracts, but can also become an issue for any faculty member in a difficult work situation or with doubts about career goals. Sorcinelli (1986) noted that faculty in the pure sciences are not likely to be interested in teaching projects before tenure, but are interested in developing relationships with mentors. Mentoring programs are one way to support career development; another is direct consultation. Wheeler (1988) describes how he began addressing career issues in consulting with faculty and discusses both approaches and techniques that can be adapted to other programs.

2. Assist faculty in developing their general professional skills.

Writing is the stuff of academic life. Although most often connected with research productivity, writing skill has a tremendous impact on teaching and service roles as well. Syllabi, handouts, tests, and textbooks illustrate the variability and impact of faculty writing skills. Skill in writing memos and reports affects the time spent on and effectiveness in committee work. Yet, like teaching, writing is seldom taught in graduate programs

(Figgins & Burbach, 1989). Students mimic their professors, and only the best and worst receive feedback.

Boice (1984, 1987, 1988) has developed a framework for incorporating writing support into faculty development programs and discussed more fully why this is desirable (see especially Boice & Turner, 1987 and Boice, 1988). Using Boice's work and other materials, I have offered writing seminars over the past two years. Although I have not followed up seminar sessions with the impromptu visits Boice recommends (nor can I claim the same level of success), the writing program is both enjoyable and appreciated and has allowed me to work with faculty who do not typically attend more traditional programs. Including writing need not take away from teaching improvement efforts. Boice (1984) reported that faculty at his institution "excelled in individual and in combined programs. Quantitative (but sometimes subjective) measures of teaching skills and of scholarly writing increased significantly" (p. 206).

Similar arguments can be made for other professional skills such as time management or memory enhancement; improvements in these areas stand to benefit faculty in all their roles. In my experience, faculty tend to be less attracted to these topics. Yet, included in a diverse program, time management or memory workshops can engage and assist faculty who usually avoid professional development.

3. Involve faculty in scholarly work directly related to their teaching.

Cross's (1987) call for research within college classrooms reminds us that teaching decisions are made in the same way career decisions are: by individual faculty. She notes that although teachers daily make critical educational decisions, research that involves teachers directly is strangely absent. The approach that Cross and Angelo describe as classroom research (Angelo, 1989; Angelo & Cross, 1989; Cross, 1987) offers faculty developers a new opportunity to combine teaching and research directly in the classroom. Such research projects begin small, focusing on the impact of teaching practices or materials within a single classroom, but they can move on to bigger issues as faculty become more skilled and interested in this area (Angelo & Cross, 1989).

Cross (1987) links her concept of classroom research to Schon's (1983) work on reflective practice. Zitlow (1987) builds on this concept and describes a program of practice-centered inquiry into teaching which combines seminars with in-class research. Smith and Schwartz (1988) provide detailed examples of how reflection on practice can form the basis

for consulting with faculty about their teaching. These new approaches to consulting and research provide a method for involving faculty directly in examining their work as teachers and represent one way to renew the understanding and influence of educational consultants in higher education.

Another approach to integrating scholarship and teaching involves a new “respect [for] discipline-specific ways of knowing” (Angelo, 1989, p. 47). Lee Shulman (1990) argues that scholarship and teaching are inextricably combined within the disciplines, that the content to be taught has a critical impact on how it is presented. Situating teaching improvement within specific disciplines is exemplified in the Program for Faculty Renewal at Stanford (Menges, Mathis, Halliburton, Marincovich, & Svinicki, 1988). While the program focused on disciplinary content rather than teaching skills:

Neglect of pedagogy as a major theme of the workshops does not reflect indifference to teaching on the part of the program. As the broadened definition of faculty development implies, to excite faculty about teaching requires first that they be excited about their traditional content-centered roles. (p. 296)

Each of the three approaches described here represents an opportunity and a challenge for faculty development. Recognizing and responding to a broader range of faculty needs provides an opportunity to improve our services and enhance our impact. At the same time, new areas challenge both how we think about faculty and the skills we bring to our work. Exploring one or more of these options can enhance both faculty development programs and our own professional renewal.

Conclusion

Young (1987) attributes the limited impact of faculty development to its failure to recognize the essential integration of teaching and research:

Faculty members judge themselves and are judged by others in the complex of their roles. Faculty professional development programs need to do the same. ...The key is a closer look at the ‘profession’ of college teaching—its mixed nature, its multiple features, and its necessary complexity. (p. 14)

Faculty enjoy a great deal of autonomy in their work. In fact, that level of personal control is what many faculty value most about academic life.

The flip side of individual control, however, is less control at the organizational level than many administrators, some faculty, and some faculty developers would like. One personal consequence of professional autonomy is the absence of formal guidelines about what faculty should be doing and why. When graduate students and new faculty form strong mentoring relationships with established members of the academy, career guidance is provided through the mentor. But much evidence exists that suggests that many are not receiving the advice and support they need. I have argued in this paper that faculty developers are well placed to meet some of these broader professional needs and, by doing so, can enhance their impact within higher education.

Loose coupling within universities makes the concept of faculty role orientation both intelligible and interesting as a framework for analyzing faculty behavior. A recent survey of over 1500 faculty found that “almost two thirds of the respondents indicated they had developed a ‘niche’ for themselves within the institution, over half had developed a niche beyond the institution” (Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrmann, & Wergin, 1988, p. 11). Faculty recognize the opportunities inherent in an open environment and the need to define one’s own role. “More than two-thirds [of the respondents] expressed strong feelings of control over their careers. ...The high level of satisfaction among faculty is in part owing to their sense of efficacy and control” (Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrmann, & Wergin, 1989, p. 13).

Shirley Clark (1986) felt that “the unresolved combination of teaching and research” (p. 32) caused serious problems for institutions and individuals. Yet role ambiguity need not be a source of stress; for some it is an opportunity for creativity and negotiation (Mortimer & Simmons, 1978). Resolving the question of balance for all may be undesirable as well as impossible. Instead, faculty developers can assist faculty in exploring their goals and options and developing a solution – a niche – that is right for them.

Realizing that faculty legitimately engage in a range of role orientations might dampen discussions of whether faculty are “really” teachers or “really” scholars. The academic matrix suggests how such confusion can occur. The best scholars at a four-year college are likely to identify themselves as such when asked about their professional role, yet their research activity is considerably less than the top scholars at a research university. As Burton Clark (1987) pointed out, a one-dimensional model obscures the substantial differences across institutions in what constitutes teaching and scholarly work. Role definitions are made in context.

The critical problems associated with improving instruction in colleges and universities will not go away. The same faculty who report feeling satisfied and in control of their careers also felt that teaching was more important to them than to their institutions, while the reverse was true for research (Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrmann, & Wergin, 1989). Perhaps the relevant question for teaching improvement efforts is not "How can we interest faculty in teaching?" but "How can we develop the teaching role to recognize faculty achievements within the context of the academic career?" Teaching awards are valuable and recognized by faculty as critical events. But few faculty actually receive them, and they do not provide the ongoing reinforcement of research grants and publications, promotions in rank, or administrative appointments. Expanding faculty development programs might provide new insights into how to develop rewards and achievements in teaching.

Finally, faculty developers also balance expectations for consulting and scholarship, teaching and service. As we begin talking with faculty about their professional lives, perhaps we can learn something from them about how to integrate multiple professional roles into a productive and enjoyable career.

References

- Angelo, T.A. (1989). Faculty development for learning: The promise of classroom research. In S. Kahn, R. Boice, L. Border, L. Hilsen, A. Roberts, and M.D. Sorcinelli (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*, 8, 37-60.
- Angelo, T.A., & Cross, K.P. (1989, Fall). Classroom research for teaching assistants. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, and D.H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teaching assistant training in the 1990s*, 39, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 99-108.
- Armour, R., Caffarella, R., Fuhrmann, B., & Wergin, J. (1989, March). *Senior faculty careers and personal development: A survey*. Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco.
- Bird, B.A., & Allen, D.N. (1989). Faculty entrepreneurship in research university environments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60, 583-596.
- Boice, R. (1984). Reexamination of traditional emphases in faculty development. *Research in Higher Education*, 21, 195-207.
- Boice, R. (1987). Is released time an effective component of faculty development programs? *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 311-327.
- Boice, R. (1988). Faculty development programs based around scholarly writing. In K.G. Lewis and J.T. Powlacs (Eds.), *Face to face* (pp. 217-236). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

- Boice, R., & Turner, J.L. (1987). Faculty developers as facilitators of scholarly writing. In J. Kurfiss, L. Hilsen, L. Mortensen, and E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 103-114.
- Bowen H.R., & Schuster, J.H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, S.M. (1986). The academic profession and career: Perspectives and problems. *Teaching Sociology*, 14, 24-34.
- Cornwall, J.R., & Grimes, A.J. (1987). Cosmopolitan-local: A cross-lagged correlation analysis of the relationship between professional role orientation and behaviors in an academic organization. *Human Relations*, 40, 281-298.
- Cross, K.P. (1987). The need for classroom research. In J. Kurfiss, L. Hilsen, L. Mortensen, and E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 3-17.
- Entrekin, L.V., & Everett, J.E. (1981). Age, and midcareer crisis: An empirical study of academics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 19, 84-97.
- Feldman, K.A. (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 227-299.
- Figgins, M.A., & Burbach, H.J. (1989). Preparing our students to publish: Lessons learned. *Innovative Higher Education*, 14, 15-23.
- Finkelstein, M.J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Glaser, B.G. (1964). *Organizational scientists: Their professional careers*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 281-306.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 444-480.
- 'In' box. (1989, October 18). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B1.
- Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lammers, C.J. (1974). Localism, cosmopolitanism, and faculty response. *Sociology of Education*, 47, 129-158.
- Light, D. (1974). Introduction: The structure of the academic professions. *Sociology of Education*, 47, 2-28.
- Mathis, B.C. (1983). Faculty development in a decade of transition. In M. Davis, M. Fisher, S.C. Inglis, & S. Scholl (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*, 2, 29-38.
- Menges, R. J., Mathis, B.C., Halliburton, D., Marincovich, M., & Svinicki, M. (1988). Strengthening professional development: Lessons from the program for faculty renewal at Stanford. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 291-304.

- Mortimer, J.T., & Simmons, R.G. (1978). Adult socialization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 4, 421-54.
- Reynolds, A. (1990, April). *Charting the changes in junior faculty: Relationships among socialization, acculturation, and gender*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Boston.
- Rice, R.E. (1986). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. *Teaching Sociology*, 14, 12-23.
- Schein, E.H. (1968, Winter). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review*, 1-16.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shulman, L. (1990, April). *The transformation of knowledge: A model of pedagogical reasoning and action* (The Distinguished Contributions to Educational Research 1989 Recipient's Address). Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Boston.
- Smith, R., & Schwartz, F. (1989, April). *Improving teaching by reflecting on practice*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, New Orleans.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1986). Tracing academic career paths: Implications for faculty development. In M. Svinicki, J. Kurfiss, & J. Stone (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*, 5, 169-181.
- Toombs, W. (1975). A three-dimensional view of faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education*, 46, 701-717.
- Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1-19.
- Weick, K.E. (1984). Contradictions in a community of scholars: The cohesion-accuracy tradeoff. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), *College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 211-247). New York University Press: New York.
- Wheeler, D.W. (1988). Career consulting: A critical segment of a comprehensive faculty development program. In K.G. Lewis and J.T. Povlacs (Eds.), *Face to face* (pp. 195-215). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Young, R.E. (1987, May-June). Faculty development and the concept of "profession." *Academe*, 73, 12-14.
- Zitlow, C.S. (1987, April). *Dimensions of faculty participation in a program designed to promote practice-centered inquiry*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Washington, DC.